



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,162	01/11/2002	Shahram Mostafazadeh	NSC1P225R	3102
22434	7590	03/01/2006	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			PHAM, THANH V	
P.O. BOX 70250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			2823	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/044,162	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MOSTAFAZADEH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Thanh V. Pham	<b>Art Unit</b> 2823	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 14 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.  
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 02/14/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is partially agreed that the resin member 2 *invented by Ogawa may be a permanent* structure (emphasized by applicant although the term "permanent" does not appear in Ogawa) of the formed semiconductor element 4 and the inner lead of lead-frame 9 on the tape 2. However, the rejection is based, not on Ogawa's invention, but on Ogawa recognized known prior art of fig. 5 wherein "the resin film 2, as an element-mounting member, joins a semiconductor element 4 with the resin type adhesive agent 3, thereby wire-bonding both the semiconductor element 4 and the inner lead 1 with a thin metal wire 5 to be electrically connected" (col. 2, lines 9-14). "The adhesive force between the resin type adhesive agent and these metal materials is not necessarily sufficient" (Ogawa's col. 2, lines 20-21) so that resin film 2 being peeled off in the next step beyond Ogawa. The step of removing the adhesive tape after the step of forming the plastic casing is based on the teaching of Melton wherein both plastic casing and tape removing are taught to put the cased package onto board. The Melton reference teaches continuing process steps suitable for use after Ogawa wherein Ogawa's product of fig. 5 is further processed with Melton's plastic casing and tape peeling. In other words, the prior art as of Ogawa's fig. 5, a bared naked IC with easier removed adhesion, is modified/continued satisfactorily for its intended purpose with the process of Melton to complete the process by assembling, not a bared naked IC, but the cased package onto board with the tape peeling step as taught by Melton. Therefore, the

removing step of Melton would **not** defeat the purposed of Ogawa's prior art as alleged. The alleged "permanent" component of Ogawa until the step of wire-bonding both the semiconductor element 4 and the inner lead 1 with a thin metal wire 5 to be electrically connected could be accepted as in the above and does not teach against "an adhesive coating for temporarily securing integrated circuit die 12 to lead frame 22 during processing" (Melton's col. 2, lines 55-59).

Applicant's argument about adhesive tape does not contradict to the above. The argument on a "rather complex process" of Melton, though the same as the non-claimed instant invention, is irrelevant because only the casing step and the tape peeling step of Melton are used to complete the structure/process of the whole assembly process. The rejection in the Office action mailed 01-31/2006 clearly states: "the steps of casing and tape removing of Melton et al. would be selected in the manufacturing process to complete the package device as disclosed by Ogawa et al. and to protect the active face, the wire leads and inner surface of the die as taught by Melton et al. This combination will ensure the adhesive tape holds the die and lead frame in place during the wire bonding operation, the molded plastic casing comes into contact with the adhesive tape such that a lower surface of the plastic casing is substantially co-planar with the lower surfaces of the lead frame and the die, and to expose the lower surfaces of the die and the leads, whereby exposed portions of the leads form the only external accessible I/O contacts for a resulting integrated circuit package and plastic material fills at least portions of gaps formed between adjacent leads such that the lower surface of

the package is substantially co-planar and includes exposed portions of the plastic casing, the lead frame and the die.”


2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh V. Pham whose telephone number is 571-272-1866. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Smith can be reached on 571-272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WP

02/21/2006

  
George Fourson  
Primary Examiner